## Section IV:
## AMENDMENT UNDER 37 CFR §1.121
## REMARKS

### Summary of Telephone Interview

On August 9, 2004, applicant's agent contacted the Examiner to verify the proper period for reply for the Office Action, as the Office Action Summary appeared to show an erroneous period. Examiner confirmed that the Summary should have shown 3 (three) months shortened statutory period for reply.

### Telephone Interview Request

Applicant hereby requests a telephone interview with the Examiner upon receipt and consideration of this Reply. Examiner is requested to contact applicant's agent, Robert H. Frantz, by telephone at 405-812-5613 to indicate a time and date at which the Examiner would like to receive a call from applicant's agent. The proposed subject of the interview is to answer any questions the Examiner may have regarding the current amendment and reply remarks, and to consider any supplemental changes the Examiner may suggest.

### Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action, the examiner has rejected claims 1- 22 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) for lack of novelty as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Number 6,483,523 to Feng (hereinafter "Feng"). Claims 1, 8 and 15 are independent claims.

With respect to the rejections of Claims 1, 8 and 15, Feng only provides one profile for each user (e.g. one profile per user), which is reasonable as there is only one application being controlled by Feng's invention (e.g. a web browser).

Our system, however, provides multiple profiles for each user, with each profile representing a different set of accessibility setting for a different application program, system function, or set of conditions of use of an application program or system function (e.g. dialing a certain telephone number using an autodialer).

One function we disclosed, but did not original specify in our claims, was our system

function which provided for a policy of how to resolve simultaneous activation of multiple profiles for a user. This is necessary when a user activates or executes two or more system functions or application programs simultaneously, and especially when the accessibility profiles attempt to define settings which conflict. For example, the autodialer program profile for User A may set the speaker volume to maximum, while the CD player application profile may set the volume to medium. Our system provides a policy for determining which profile settings override other settings, so that the accessibility factors can be properly set as multiple functions and programs run simultaneously.

Feng is silent as to this handling of simultaneously applicable profiles because Feng only provides settings for one program (e.g. their web browser user interface). We have amended Claims 1, 8, and 15 to specify these steps, functions, and limitations, which are not taught by Feng.

With respect to Claims 2 and 9 in which we specify a user-controlled assignment of an accessibility profile to a user-selected system function or application program, wherein the selection is made from a plurality of available system functions and application programs, Feng is silent as to this function as Feng only discloses user interface profiles for a single application program (e.g. their web browser user interface). In the Office Action, the following passage of Feng's disclosure was cited as teaching this element, step, or limitation, with which we respectfully disagree:

> To achieve these and other objects of the present invention, there is provided a personalized interface browser for browsing information of a data bank, which comprises a browser display means for displaying a **browser interface** for enabling the user to browse the information of the data bank, a set of browser interface models corresponding to predetermined types of users for **defining the appearance and function of the browser interface** displayed on the display means, and a personal profile for recording the type of user corresponding to the user who currently uses the personalized interface browser, wherein when the current user starting the browser display means to display **the browser interface,** a corresponding browser interface model is picked up from the predetermined **browser interface models** subject to the

personal profile of the current user, **for adjusting the appearance and
function of the browser interface.** (Feng, Col. 2 lines 6 - 22, emphasis
added)

Feng is silent as to the user's ability to assign a profile to an application program *other
than a browser interface*, because Feng's invention assumes each profile is for their application
program (e.g. their web browser user interface). We have amended Claims 2 and 9 to clarify this
step, element or limitation which is not taught by Feng. Claims 2 and 9 recite steps, elements, or
limitations not taught by Feng, as previously discussed in reference to Claims 1 and 8, and with
respect to assignment of profiles to a user-selected application program or system function.

With respect to the rejection of Claims 3, 10 and 17, Examiner has stated that our step,
element or limitation of launching a companion program as defined by an application program's
or system function's associated accessibility profile is taught by Feng in the following passage:

> ...Therefore, when a user starts the browser, the browser automatically
> picks up a browser interface corresponding to the user's personal data
> and operational habits stored in the corresponding personal profile, so
> as to synthesize the appearance and function of the actual browser
> interface. (Col. 3, lines 25 - 29)

Applicant respectfully disagrees with Examiner's assertion, as this passage is clearly
silent as to any functionality associated with the launching of another application program (e.g. a
"companion" program) which is indicated to be launched when a first program is executed, as
defined by the first program's accessibility profile. Feng does not teach companion program
launching as we have claimed, and fails to teach the limitations as previously discussed with
respect to the rejections of Claims 1, 8 and 15.

With respect to the rejections of Claims 5, 12, and 19 wherein we have recited the functionality to organize accessiblity profiles into groups of profiles with inherency of characteristics of profiles within a group, Examiner has stated that Feng discloses groups of profiles in the following passage:

> FIG. 2 is a schematic drawing explaining the concept of setting up browser interface models. As stated above, **browser interface models** are set up subject to **predetermined** types of users. In FIG. 2, the user type data bank 7 comprises a number of predetermined user type models U.sub.1.about.U.sub.n, that describe the characteristics of the users. The user type models U.sub.1.about.U.sub.n, correspond to the browser interface models B.sub.1.about.B.sub.n in the browser interface model data bank 104. According to the present invention, the user type models correspond to the browser interface models one to one. For example, in an application of VOD, the user type model U.sub.1 is defined to be "male, age: within 20.about.29, favorites: particular type of motion pictures", and the corresponding browser interface model B.sub.1 defines the browser interface subject to this user type model U.sub.1, for example, to display in priority motion pictures suitable for this type of user for selection. Therefore, through the browser interface models set in the browser interface model data bank 104, the best browser interface is determined subject to different users. (Col. 3, lines 45 - 62, emphasis added)

While Feng discloses "types of users" for model profiles, these are predetermined and unchangeable by the user, or at least Feng is silent as to how a user may change these model interfaces by types.   For this reason, and for the foregoing reasons as discussed with respect to Claims 1, 8 and 15, applicant submits that Feng does not teach all of the claimed elements, steps and limitations of our Claims 5, 12, and 19.

With respect to Claims 6, 13, and 20, wherein we have claimed transferring a user's profiles from one system to another, Examiner has stated that Feng teaches this step, element, or limitation in the following passage:

> When started, the control unit 100 recognizes the ID (identification) of the user 1, then finds out the corresponding personal profile from the personal profile data bank 106, and then determines the closest browser interface model subject to the data of the searched personal profile, and then finds out of the browser interface model from the browser interface model data bank 104, and then synthesizes and outputs the actual browser interface. (Col. 3, lines 33 - 40)

This passage is silent as to movement or copying of a user profile from one system to another, but rather describes how Feng's system determines which user interface model to use to synthesize an actual browser interface. Applicant respectfully disagrees that any mention of copying or transferring of a profile from one system to another is taught by Feng, as well as Feng's failure to teach all elements, steps, and limitations as previously discussed with respect to Claims 1, 8, and 15.

With respect to the remaining claims which depend from Claims 1, 8, and 15, Feng fails to teach all claimed elements, steps, or limitations as previously discussed.

## Conclusion

Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of all rejections because the cited reference, Feng's patent, does not properly anticipate the claimed invention, as it fails to disclose all the claimed steps, elements or limitations.   MPEP 2131 states:

> TO ANTICIPATE A CLAIM, THE REFERENCE MUST TEACH EVERY ELEMENT OF THE CLAIM *(capitalization emphasis found in original text)*

For the foregoing reasons, applicant requests allowance of the claims as amended.

###